

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of February 28, 2011 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 14, 15, 21, and 32 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14-17, 19-27, and 32 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14-16, 21, 22, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is traversed below.

Notwithstanding whether the section 112, first paragraph rejection is proper, the recitations related to a transmission of instructions for interchangeably displaying abbreviated and full titles have been deleted from independent claims 1 and 9. Similar remarks apply with respect to the recitations in claim 32. Based on the amendments, withdrawal of the section 112, first paragraph rejection is requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 9, 17, 21-23, 25 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,559,548 to Davis, et al. (“Davis”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,960,383 to Fleischer (“Fleischer”) and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2009/0019485 to Ellis, et al. (“Ellis”)¹.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 16, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer, further in view of Ellis, and still further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,279,018 to Kudrolli, et al. (“Kudrolli”).

Claims 6 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer, further in view of Ellis, and still further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,981,217 to Knauff, et al. (“Knauff”).

¹ The listing of documents at page 4 of the Office Action fails to include Ellis, yet the Office Action at page 6 bases the rejection of the referenced claims on a combination of Davis, Fleischer, and Ellis. For purposes of this paper, Applicants presume the Office intended the enumeration provided herein. If the Office intended a different enumeration, clarification is requested in the next communication.

Claims 7 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer, further in view of Ellis, still further in view of Kudrolli, and still further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,374,225 to Hejna, Jr. (“Hejna”).

Claims 24, 26 and 27 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer, further in view of Ellis, and still further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,169,543 to Wehmeyer (“Wehmeyer”).

These rejections are traversed below.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, among other features, “wherein the transmitted abbreviated program title and the transmitted original program title are configured to be interchanged in a program title field of the electronic program guide at a first location.” Illustrative, non-limiting support for the above-noted features recited in claim 1 may be found in the filed specification when read as a whole, and for example, at paragraph [0020] (describing that the full text of the program may be displayed, when zooming in, rather than the abbreviated version created by this process).

The above-noted features recited in claim 1 are similar to the features that were previously recited in claim 1 (as discussed above, the prior recitations were deleted in the present paper in response to the section 112, first paragraph rejection). In rejecting claim 1 under section 103, the Office Action at page 6 concedes that Davis and Fleischer fail to teach displaying an abbreviated program title *interchangeably* with an original program title in *a* program title field of an electronic program guide at *a* first location. The Office Action at page 6 contends that Ellis at paragraphs [0127]-[0128] describes such features. Applicants disagree. Specifically, Ellis at paragraphs [0127]-[0128] and Figure 7 merely describes a program information screen 150 that includes the name of a program that is possibly editorially shortened to fit into the screen space available and a separate region 155 that may also display the full title of the program in the case that the title was editorially shortened. Thus, as shown in Figure 7 of Ellis, there is not any interchange between the alleged abbreviated program title and the alleged original program title, as both the alleged abbreviated program title and the alleged original program title are displayed within program information screen 150. Moreover, in claim 1, the interchange takes place in *a* program title field of an electronic program guide at *a* first location. Conversely, in Ellis, any

alleged interchange takes place in at least two locations as shown in Figure 7. Claim 1 is distinguishable from the applied documents for at least the foregoing reasons (notwithstanding whether a combination of Davis, Fleischer, and Ellis would have been proper).

Independent claims 9 and 17 recite features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1. Claims 9 and 17 are distinguishable from the applied documents for at least reasons substantially similar to those described above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims are distinguishable from the applied documents for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, as any of the additional documents (e.g., Kudrolli, Knauft, Hejna, or Wehmeyer) fail to remedy the deficiencies of Davis, Fleischer, and Ellis described above (notwithstanding whether any of the combinations of documents would have been proper).

The dependent claims are further distinguishable from the applied documents in view of the features recited therein. For example, claim 32 (as amended) recites “wherein the transmitted abbreviated program title and the transmitted original program title are configured to be interchanged in the program title field responsive to a zoom command.” Davis, Fleischer and Ellis, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above-noted features recited in claim 32. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Ellis fails to describe that an abbreviated program title and an original program title are configured to be interchanged in a program title field. Moreover, Ellis at paragraphs [0127]-[0128] describes a display of program guide information screen 150 in Figure 7 in response to a program selection having been received (for example, from listing screen 140 of Figure 6). Receiving a selection of a program is not the same thing as a zoom command as recited in claim 32. Neither Davis nor Fleischer, alone or in combination, cures the deficiencies of Ellis. As such, claim 32 is distinguishable from the applied documents for at least these additional reasons.

With respect to claims 6 and 14, without acquiescing to this rejection, the “adverbs” and “adjectives” as allegedly described in Knauft have been deleted from the group recited in amended claims 6 and 14. *See* the Office Action at page 9. Claims 6 and 14 are further distinguishable from the applied documents in view of the features recited therein.

With respect to claims 7 and 15, without acquiescing to this rejection, the “nouns” as allegedly described in Hejna have been deleted from the group recited in amended claims 7 and

15. *See* the Office Action at page 10. Claims 7 and 15 are further distinguishable from the applied documents in view of the features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: May 12, 2011

By: /Mark E. Wilinski/
Mark E. Wilinski
Registration No. 63,230

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001